NOTICE
CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO REFUSE TO CONSENT TO ANY MEDICAL SERVICE

- I do not consent to any medical procedure or service including but not limited to: diagnostic, therapeutic or preventative such as vaccination, medical tests, mask wearing etc.

- The doctor patient relationship is a contract and therefore voluntary in law, **Breen v Williams HCA 1996 BRENNAN CJ**

- **The doctor undertakes by the contract** between them to advise and treat the patient with reasonable skill and care, no third party can exist.

- No Medical service can be forced against your free will and is strictly prohibited under sect 51(xxiiiA) of the Constitution which guarantees protections and prohibitions, contained within s51 (xxiiiA), s51 (ix), 52 (ii) 69 and s92, afforded by the Commonwealth Constitution 1900 UK.

- The Commonwealth, a State, employer, service provider, registered health practitioner, corporation or business are prohibited to force a medical service such as listed at point 1, onto any person without their consent, as it would infringe on the prohibition on civil conscription in relation to medical services contained with s51(xxiiiA) of the Constitution.

- Medical services forced or coerced onto a person without their consent would constitute as assault and abuse, indictable charges with penalty of up of to 20 years imprisonment.

- Emotional distress, common in assault and abuse cases can be classed as a pure phycological injury or nervous shock. In the event of intentional infliction of emotional trauma through deliberate actions, compensation may be sought as is well established in tort law Giller v Procopets.

- All State Constitutions, Acts etc. are subject to the Constitution 1900 UK pursuant to section 106. When a law of a State is inconsistent with a law of the Commonwealth, the latter shall prevail, and the former shall, to the extent of the inconsistency, be invalid pursuant to section 109. Hence any Act whether State or Federal, be null and void if repugnant or inconsistent with the Constitution.

- Precedents for our constitutional guaranteed protection is also found in case law, **Wong v Commonwealth HCA 2009 KIRBY J**

125. Normally, in our society, the provision of "medical and dental services" occurs pursuant to a private contract entered into between the healthcare provider and the patient[152]. The purpose of incorporating a prohibition on "civil conscription" in the provision of such services is thus to preserve such a contractual relationship between the provider and the patient, at least to the extent that each might wish their relationship to be governed by such a contract.

126. In this sense, the prohibition is expressed for purposes of protection, including a protection extending to the patient. It is designed to ensure the continuance in Australia of

the individual provision of such services, as against their provision, say, entirely by a government-employed (or government-controlled) healthcare profession.

127. This does not mean that there cannot be the provision of "medical and dental services" otherwise than by individual suppliers, including for example public hospitals and private insurers. However, the prohibition on "any form of civil conscription" is designed to protect patients from having the supply of "medical and dental services", otherwise than by private contract, forced upon them without their consent.

128. A rare constitutional guarantee: Because of its character as a guarantee or protection, both for the healthcare professionals identified and for the patients affected by the provision of their services, the exclusion of any form of "civil conscription" must be seen as one of the rare instances of an individual guarantee and protection spelt out in the Australian Constitution. The fact that the Constitution has taken the trouble to afford such a guarantee is a strong reason for upholding a broad ambit for the prohibition, to the full extent that the words permit.

Date:

Name Printed:

Signature: